

world. We must find a solution and create comprehensive health care reform for all Americans.

□ 0915

#### TAX-AS-THEY-SPEND

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Democrats have announced they plan to actually use pay-as-you-go budgetary rules. You may remember how House Democrats have often cited PAYGO, while simultaneously finding any and every opportunity to disregard it. The zeal to spend taxpayer dollars is just too much. This would account for the fact that since Democrats have assumed control of Congress, the annual budgets deficits have ballooned over 11 times, from \$160 billion to \$1.8 trillion.

It is clear that PAYGO, as proposed by our Democrat colleagues, is not so much about limiting the size of government as it is paying for a larger and more intrusive big government. This is entirely against the fiscal spirit of responsibility because it means Congress can continue to spend recklessly, as long as they find new and burdensome ways to tax more American families. Under this administration and their allies in Congress, pay-as-you-go should be more correctly called tax-as-they-spend.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th and the Global War on Terrorism.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today, the House leadership will unveil a uniquely American solution for health care reform. It will build upon existing programs like Medicare and Medicaid that will be improved significantly. It will say to employers that if you like the health insurance you're providing your employees, we want you to keep it, and we will certainly encourage more employers to provide health insurance for their employees.

But for those Americans who have no health insurance, or those Americans who have difficulty affording health insurance because they have to go out on the individual market, or have a small group plan that becomes very expensive, those individuals will be able to buy cheaper health insurance, much more low-cost health insurance through what the Federal Government would provide. There will be competition between public and private plans, and that will be our way of reducing costs. Because what this plan will do primarily is to reduce costs for most Americans and, at the same time, make sure that every American has health insurance.

I can't tell you how important that is. It is so important that every American know that they can have quality and affordable health insurance. It basically allows them to have peace of mind to not have to worry about whether they have one job or another, and this is what we're doing because we believe it's important for the average American.

#### INCREASED SPENDING FOR CONGRESS

(Mr. JORDAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last night the Democrat-controlled Congress decided to prohibit any amendment that would have reduced spending for today's legislation that funds Congress.

That's right. At a time when the American taxpayer, the American families, American small business owners are tightening their belts, the Democrat-controlled Congress would not allow any reduction in what it spends on itself.

This is an outrage. Families are tightening their belts; small business owners are tightening their belts; American taxpayers are tightening their belts. And this Congress wouldn't even allow an amendment to be made in order which would say, let's live on what we lived on last year. Let's not increase spending for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage, and should not be tolerated.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2918, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution H. Res. 559 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 559

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2918) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative McCarthy of New York or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or

10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlelady from North Carolina, Dr. Foxx. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 2918, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for 2010, under a structured rule.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act provides \$3.7 billion for key investments in the legislative branch, not including Senate-related items for fiscal year 2010, including funding for the Architect of the Capitol, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Printing Office, the Capitol Police, and the Open World Program.

This bill provides a pragmatic and fiscally responsible approach to funding our legislative branch. Actually, spending is increased only by 7 percent, less than half of the 15 percent increase requested.

The funding provided in this legislation will help us do our jobs better and faster. It increases funding for the Congressional Budget Office by \$1 million, making it easier for Members to obtain PAYGO analysis of their proposals, a vital service, given our need for responsible government spending.

This bill also allocates funds for a complete overhaul of the House of Representatives' antiquated voting system, which, after 33 years of good use, has become increasingly unreliable.

Further, this measure increases the Members Representational Allowance to ensure that we're able to adequately serve our districts, and increases our funding of standing and select committees by 3 percent to accommodate the increased legislative and oversight workload typically seen in the second session.

These funds will provide us with the resources necessary to carry out the

sweeping legislative initiatives of President Obama and Democrats in Congress and to better retain our most experienced and talented staff.

In addition, this bill will also help protect and preserve the Capitol complex, both from physical decay, and from the security risks it obviously faces in this post-9/11 world.

It includes \$60 million to establish a Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund in order to more evenly spread out the cost of large-scale historic building projects within the Capitol complex, including the repair of the iconic Capitol dome and the revitalization of the 100-year-old Cannon House Building.

It also provides an increase in funding of 6 percent for the Capitol Police—and if I had my way, that would be more—who work day and night to ensure that the U.S. Capitol complex is secure for not only Members of Congress, but for our staffs and the millions of visitors that come through each year.

Finally, this appropriations bill helps make the work of the legislative branch more accessible to people throughout our Nation and across the globe.

I'm encouraged through this bill. The Appropriations Committee has helped to ensure that all visitors touring the U.S. Capitol have equal and adequate access, whether they be part of a tour led by our talented CVC tour guides or by our hardworking staff and interns.

Additionally, this bill increases funding by \$40 million for the Library of Congress, an institution which not only provides a vital resource to Congress, but also preserves a universal collection of knowledge, history, and creativity for current and future generations.

\$15 million of these funds will help modernize the Library's information technology infrastructure to make the library and its unique resources more widely available to Congress and the broader public.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislative Branch Appropriations bill strikes a pragmatic balance between the growing demands upon this Congress and the legislative branch, and the economic realities this Nation is facing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding time for us to discuss the rule.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have a situation here that partly was demonstrated yesterday in terms of the Republican concern on how we are going to do business in the House. Yesterday the Democrats made in order only one amendment which had been offered to this rule. Twenty total amendments were submitted, 14 by Republicans, four by Democrats, and two that were bipartisan. Two years ago, they made three of 23 amendments in order, which is three times as many as now.

Last year we didn't even consider appropriations bills on the floor, so maybe an argument could be made that that was even worse. And even though the Democrats were in charge last year, they blame Republicans for the fact that we couldn't deal with the appropriations bills on the floor and the fact that there was a Republican President.

But, in 2006, the last year Republicans were in the majority, we made all seven amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order. That's the way it should be. We should be debating these bills on the floor.

Earlier, our colleague from Michigan implied that requiring debate and voting on issues before the House is dysfunctional. It is exactly what the people of this country have sent us here for. They want us to take positions on these issues and not hide behind them.

We keep wondering what the Democrats are afraid of. Why do they not want amendments on the floor? They have a majority, a fairly large majority, but they refuse to debate these issues.

I would now like to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Nevada, Mr. HELLER.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, which proposes a \$300 million increase over last year for the operations of this House. That's a 6.3 increase at a time most Americans' budgets are shrinking. \$51 million of this increase goes to Members Representational Allowances, or the MRA, which we all use for operating our offices and keeping in touch with our constituents.

Now, I'll be the first to tell you that my office could use an MRA increase. My district is 105,000 square miles. I fly several hundred thousand miles every year, I probably drive another 50,000 miles in my district. Traveling my largely rural district and staying in touch with thousands of Nevadans takes a significant amount of MRA funds. But I am always mindful of the fact that MRA funds are simply taxpayer dollars by another name, and I have a responsibility to use those funds wisely.

□ 0930

Many of my constituents and many of yours are making due with less than they had last year. As public servants, we have a responsibility to make similar sacrifices. Some counties in my district are facing 15 percent unemployment. Statewide unemployment is hovering around 11 percent, well above the national average of 9 percent. Nevada's current unemployment level is at the highest rate of joblessness since they began keeping track, or keeping record, in 1976. Our State budget crisis led the Nevada legislature to cut back services some 20 percent. Meanwhile, Nevada has been hit the hardest by the wave of foreclosures sweeping the United States.

Those lucky enough to have jobs are also making tough decisions. Moms and dads across the country are sitting around their kitchen tables, deciding what must be cut from their family budgets to ensure they can pay their bills and feed their children as the cost of living continues to skyrocket. Meanwhile, as a whole, our Nation faces an \$11 trillion debt.

Last night, in spite of irresponsible journalism this morning by the Politico to the contrary, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee that would simply retain the fiscal year 2009 funding level for the MRA. This amendment is simple. I believe it shows the Americans, who are figuring out their family budgets at their kitchen tables this morning, that they are not alone and that someone in Congress understands that these difficult times call for shared sacrifice.

We who have been given the honor of serving in this body must be part of the sacrifice, and that should start here in our offices, and it should start now. Unfortunately, my amendment was rejected by the Rules Committee.

I urge this body to reject this restrictive rule so that my amendment can come to the House floor. Give this Congress a chance to lead by example with commonsense fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), with whom I serve on the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this morning to speak about technology assessment as a tool for our legislative work. This bill funds the tools that allow us to do our best on behalf of the 300 million Americans.

Every issue that comes before us, virtually every issue, has some aspect of science and technology. Yet this Congress has not brought great credit to ourselves for our ability to deal with science and technology issues or to recognize emerging trends or the implications of technology. Fortunately, we do not have to reinvent a tool to help us in this.

Four decades ago, Congress created the Office of Technology Assessment, a congressional support agency with a professional staff. It produced reports that were noteworthy for their factual bases, for their balanced and impartial presentations, for their nonpartisan framing, and for their forward-looking perspectives. The OTA, as it was known, functioned well for 25 years.

It produced reports on such topics as retiring old cars, a program to save gasoline and to reduce emissions. That was in 1992. There were reports about bringing health care online, about electronic surveillance in the digital age, about impacts of antibiotic-resistant bacteria, and on and on. The OTA study of Alzheimer's, "Losing a Million Minds," became the bible for Alzheimer's policy in America. The OTA

study on Social Security computer systems resulted in changes, saving hundreds of millions of dollars. The OTA study on synfuels resulted in policy changes, saving far more money than was ever spent on the Office of Technology Assessment, itself. The OTA study on the use of genetic testing in the workplace, as a tool of discrimination and bias, laid the groundwork for the excellent legislation that Representative SLAUGHTER, the Chair of the Rules Committee, developed in the Genetic Nondiscrimination Act. An OTA report on the electronic delivery of Federal services led to the Food Stamp Fraud Reduction Act, and on and on.

In a fit of budget cutting, OTA's work was stopped 14 years ago with the explanation that the work could be obtained elsewhere—from other government agencies, from other congressional agencies, from interest groups, from universities, from our friends back home, from some other sources. Well, we've done the experiment. It didn't work. We have not gotten what OTA provided in the 14 years since OTA stopped operations.

Stopping OTA's functioning was a stupendous act of false economy. We have not gotten the equivalent, useful, relevant work—not from think tanks, not from interest groups, not from our universities, and not from our friends back home. A former Member of Congress described stopping the funding for OTA as a congressional self-imposed lobotomy.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to provide ourselves this useful tool. Yet the rule before us today does not allow the funding of this agency. It could have been done. It could have been done for a pittance. When OTA was fully functioning, it was far less than a percent of the budget of the legislative branch.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. If I may finish a point here.

So what are we missing?

Well, let me postulate that, if OTA had been functioning in recent years, we could have expected helpful, relevant reports on preparing for global pandemics. Congress might well have required that there be communications in mines, such as in the Sago Mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional minute in the hopes that he will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida at some point.

Mr. HOLT. We might have had communications in the mines, such as the Sago Mine, that would have allowed the miners to get out alive. I expect that we would have had better legislation dealing with corn-based ethanol. Through OTA studies, I believe that we would have recognized the overdependence of the financial sector on mathematical models.

We are missing out on a lot, Mr. Speaker. In my exasperation, I wonder

why in the world Congress would deprive itself of this useful tool. I've decided that the very reason we need OTA—our discomfort with matters scientific and technological. Our inability to deal with such things is exactly what makes it difficult for us to recognize that we need it. I regret I have no time renaming to yield to the gentlelady for Florida.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we do need to fund adequately our offices; the Capitol Police, for whom I have the greatest respect; and the Library of Congress, a real jewel for our country. As my colleague from Nevada said, American families are hurting, and we have been increasing spending by 16 percent in this area over the past 2 years. Here are the problems that we are facing in this country right now, which the American people are beginning to truly understand.

We will have a \$2 trillion deficit for fiscal year 2009. The second tranche of the TARP was allowed to be spent, which was \$350 billion. The stimulus package, which was H.R. 1, was \$787 billion, which was really over \$1 trillion with the debt cost. There was the omnibus bill, which was \$409 billion. That was the bill that funded appropriations for this year, which the Democrats said they couldn't pass last year in individual appropriations bills even though they were in charge of the Congress. The budget increased total spending to \$4 trillion in 2009, or 28 percent of the GDP, the highest Federal spending as a percentage of the GDP since World War II. Now we have this additional increase which they're asking for.

Federal spending is out of control. We have got to put a stop to this somewhere. The day before yesterday, Republicans offered 94 amendments in the Rules Committee, which were designed to cut Federal spending, but we couldn't deal with that. The Democrats cut off debate because they said it was going to take too much time to deal with this. Apparently, Democrats can't spend the American people's money fast enough. Republicans think it's time that Congress started practicing fiscal discipline. This is a good place to start.

I would now like to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Iowa, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding to me and for her stalwart representation on the Rules Committee of her constituents and of all Americans.

It is a difficult place to serve when you find yourself outvoted almost 2-1 and when you're back in a corner of a room, up on the third floor, where the press seldom goes, where the cameras almost never are, where behaviors that are not consistent with the balance of the committees on this Hill are common, and where the rights and the franchises of the elected Members of this Congress are diminished significantly by the most recent behaviors,

over the last 2½ years, of the Rules Committee. This is where this Congress is controlled.

I rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition to rule after rule that comes out of that little room up there on the third floor. For example, there was the previous bill, Justice appropriations, the one that the gentlelady mentioned. Out of all of the amendments that were offered, Republicans, I believe, were offering 94 amendments. I recall that the Rules Committee wrote a rule. It was unprecedented. It wasn't an open rule for appropriations the way we thought we might get back to.

Even though Democrats were afraid to have appropriations votes in 2008, we did have some in 2007. We have always fought this through. We'll stay late at night if we need to. Leadership can get together if it gets too long and if we can't get our business done, and we can negotiate unanimous consent agreements. That didn't happen. I've been what I thought was a victim of negotiated unanimous consent agreements that were struck quickly, where the bargain was met before we really got a chance to catch up with what it all was, but that was at least leadership coming together, compromising, negotiating and agreeing.

This was the Rules Committee, I suspect directed from above, that had written a modified open rule that required us all to print our amendments into the RECORD. Once those amendments were printed, then, of course, the other side of the aisle had the opportunity to read through all of the amendments and to understand the strategy of the Republicans. Then, having written the rule to produce a certain result, they decided it probably would not produce the result that they'd intended, so they shut down debate after the very first Republican amendment, 20-some minutes into that debate, and they went back to the Rules Committee.

I sat there until nearly 1 o'clock in the morning with a number of my colleagues who had offered constructive amendments, amendments that were designed to perfect this legislation. I saw Member after Member have to ask the Rules Committee, Will you please make my amendment in order so that my constituents can be heard? They didn't say it, but it was also so that the American people could understand the shenanigans that had been going on here. We were afraid to say that because they were afraid that their amendments wouldn't be made in order. I watched that parade in front of the Rules Committee, and I will tell you it's unprecedented that Members of Congress are reduced to having to beg, in a little room on the third floor, to be heard.

Each of us has a franchise: 1/435 of the United States of America is embodied in each one of us. Speaker PELOSI said—I believe the date was June 14, 2006—that every Member has a right to be heard and, on a different date, that

this would be the most open Congress in history.

□ 0945

Well, it's anything but that. It's becoming more and more closed—even to the point where we lose the right to offer a motion to rise or adjourn, the right to offer an amendment on an appropriations bill.

And so I had offered six amendments up there. I didn't ask the Rules Committee to make my amendments in order; they had already made my amendments in order. Every single one of them complied with the rule that was written and had been made in order. But when the majority understood that they were going to have to take some votes, some tougher votes on some subject matter that they had been ducking from, then they changed the rules.

I just said, Keep your word. You set the standards to begin with. We all met those standards. And then you made our amendments in order. We shouldn't have had to do that. It should have been an open rule to allow any Member to offer an amendment down here at the well unless that title of the bill had passed. That's the standard that's here. That's what the Founding Fathers imagined and envisioned. But we get anything but that.

And so, this Congress doesn't get to debate on important topics. We have to have a motion to recommit in order to discuss the issue of giving Miranda rights to enemy combatants in foreign continents. That's what it takes. And that little window will be closed, too, if it makes the majority uncomfortable.

We don't get to debate on the very critical national security issue, Mr. Speaker, of the Speaker of the House declaring the CIA to be a group of felonious liars and having lied to the Congress of the United States of America and then stated that she's going up to receive briefings after this.

The United States of America's national security has got to be put at risk when the person third in line for the Presidency declares our intelligence community to be lying to Congress. Decisions get made, on this floor, in committee, behind the scenes—sometimes by staff—based upon the allegations made by the Speaker. The staff wants to please the Speaker. The Speaker is ducking this issue. We need to have a vote, and I offered an amendment to get a vote on the CIA. We aren't going to get that vote because the Rules Committee shut it down.

I offered an amendment that would also clean up some of this—amendment No. 2 increases and decreases standing committee by \$1 million—so that we can broadcast the activities in the Rules Committee. When you go into a committee and you realize that you're sitting in front of a camera, it causes people to have a little better demeanor, and the decisions are there accountable to the public and some of

that actually ends up on YouTube. But the Rules Committee doesn't have that. The room is too small and it's too secret what goes on up there.

We need a big room for the Rules Committee because that's where the decisions are made in the United States Congress today, Mr. Speaker. So I offered an amendment to do that.

As I moved through this process—and by the way, not only the criticism of the intelligence community came from the Speaker but now she's taken on the Congressional Budget Office and said, Well, no, they're the most pessimistic group that there are. We always overestimate things that work against us.

Well, if you challenge the integrity of the Congressional Budget Office, it isn't long before you have intimidation of the Congressional Budget Office. When you challenge the CIA and you control their purse strings, it isn't long before you have intimidation of the CIA. You don't get the same information if you have a trust relationship going on.

And by the way, the legislation, the appropriation that passed last night was managed by an appropriations subcommittee chair that by all the news reports is under investigation, and he received the gavel from the Speaker of the House. She knew he was under investigation, and 2 years ago he recused himself from the discussions. But we've not heard any announcement as to that investigation being lifted or any of the subpoenas that may have been served have been withdrawn or that had been shut down. There was no announcement whatsoever.

How can we have confidence in this Congress if the Speaker declares the intelligence community to be lying to Congress, if the Rules Committee shuts down the debate, if this House is recessed in the middle of important business, if an impeachment of a judge is shut down so you can go raise money, or if the chairman of the subcommittee who is managing the funding for the FBI, is being investigated by the FBI? This Congress has a long way to go to get where they're going.

I would just conclude with this, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to paraphrase Joe Welch, Let us not assassinate this process further. You've done enough. Have you no sense of decency at long last? Have you no sense of decency left?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, after that speaker, I find it necessary to correct him with regard to a portion of his screed.

Please know that in the process that he referenced one of our Members, who is a subcommittee Chair of Appropriations, the committee Chair, Mr. OBEY, handled the matter, when the Member referred to by the previous speaker recused himself. And on the floor, when the matter was brought here, the committee Chair handled that matter.

Now, I heard that gentleman talk about shenanigans. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. What hap-

pened in the House of Representatives yesterday—and I've only been here 17 years—but the dean of the House of Representatives, Mr. DINGELL, was down here this morning for a 1-minute and spoke of the disgrace that took place yesterday. And someone would come in here and talk about shenanigans? What was that yesterday? How could we possibly have gotten about the business of dealing with the Nation's business when repeatedly what we saw was people coming in here delaying the process?

I have been here 17 years. We cast 54 votes yesterday. We spent more time casting votes on nonsense than we did on any substance that was being sought.

Now enough already. People have a right to their views. They have a right to their political shots. But the Rules Committee operates this body. And if they want the business of the American people done, then they wouldn't conduct the kind of shenanigans that they conducted yesterday.

I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the chairwoman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, which I thought was what we were here to talk about.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. HASTINGS. I appreciate that.

It is important that we get back to the business at hand, and I simply wanted to address the gentleman from New Jersey's remark about the Office of Technology Assessment, which is an important agency of the legislative branch that remains authorized in the U.S. statutes, but that currently does not receive funding. Especially given the age of technology and the advent of scientific progress that we are in the 21st century, I think it is incredibly important that we begin to reestablish or explore reestablishing that legislative branch agency, and I look forward to working with the gentleman and with my colleague, Mr. ADERHOLT, the ranking member, and Mr. WAMP and a number of other bipartisan members that are interested in doing that over the course of the next year.

Mr. HOLT. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLT. I appreciate the gentlelady's use of the word "bipartisan." In fact, the amendment that we had hoped would be made in order today was brought forward by three Republicans and me, a Democrat.

This is an agency that would benefit all in Congress. It has the support of many on both sides of the aisle.

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Reclaiming my time, just to point out for the Members, we do have \$2.5 million that we have carried in the legislative branch bills for the last 2 fiscal years. It is there in the GAO for technology

assessments. But we do recognize that the gentleman and many other Members on both sides of the aisle believe that it would be far better and more effective if we conduct those assessments with a staffed agency of experts and bring in the expertise that the Congress currently lacks.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to our colleague from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I, too, went to the Rules Committee to testify last night to try to have an amendment ruled in order, an amendment that was germane; there was no problem with its relevance to the bill. It was not dilatory, it wasn't seeking to delay anything. It was to address a very real problem that we have.

The problem that we have, Mr. Speaker, is that we have, that we know of, a number of investigations from the Justice Department going on right now examining the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. They're looking at the process of circular fundraising where Members of Congress will secure earmarks, or in other words, no-bid contracts for their campaign contributors. The money goes out, taxpayer money, campaign money comes back in.

Now, whether we want to admit it or not, the Justice Department is looking at this. We can talk until we're blue in the face, say there is no quid pro quo here. We're giving earmarks to those that we think need them. These no-bid contracts are going to companies that really need them. And whether or not they turned around and individuals from that organization or the lobbyists that represent them, if they contribute tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars back to my campaign committee, that's okay because it's not a quid pro quo. Whether we say that until we're blue in the face doesn't change the fact that the Justice Department seems to feel differently, and they're conducting investigations.

Now I think we do feel differently because just a few weeks ago, we authorized or instructed our own Ethics Committee to reveal whether or not they were conducting an investigation that essentially looks into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. They have since indicated that they are.

So now we have the Justice Department looking into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. We have our own Ethics Committee looking into that relationship, and yet we have, Mr. Speaker, our own Ethics Committee still issuing guidance to the Members of this body that campaign contributions do not constitute financial interest. In other words, whether or not you can contribute or give an earmark to a company, that company's executives and their lobbyists can turn around and give you campaign contributions the next day or the day before. That's okay

according to guidance coming from our own Ethics Committee—the same Ethics Committee that is investigating the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions.

The purpose of the Ethics Committee, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that the dignity of this House is maintained, that we rise above it all, that we have a standard that is perhaps higher than perhaps others have. We should have a standard that's higher than whether or not Members can be indicted or convicted over behavior that takes place here. Yet, we're allowing the Ethics Committee to issue guidance that says, It's okay. That, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

What this amendment would have done is said that no money could be spent in the bill to implement that guidance. I can't think of many more pressing issues in this House than that. It's germane. There is no reason that it couldn't be brought up and be part of the amendments that were offered today, but the Rules Committee said "no" for no other reason than they didn't want to stop the practice.

We have come to rely on earmarking to raise money around here. That's the bottom line. And we can't continue it if we're going to uphold the dignity of this body.

Mr. Speaker, at some point we will decouple the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. We have to. I just hope that we do it sooner rather than later and not have to wait to uphold the dignity of this body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend from North Carolina if she has any additional speakers. I will be our last speaker.

Ms. FOXX. We do have additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I now would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER from California.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, for yielding me the time, and I appreciate her service on the House Rules Committee.

It is absolutely true. We could move the appropriations process through the House of Representatives much more easily if the minority party didn't exist. If we weren't here creating what my friend from Fort Lauderdale has called "shenanigans" or using terms like that, we could move this process along very easily.

□ 1000

Unfortunately, the minority party, the group that represents almost half the American people, is being treated as if they don't exist. And this rule is a perfect example of just that, Mr. Speaker.

I know that people are saying that yesterday was a history-making day because there were more recorded votes on the floor of the House than have ever been held in modern history. But the real history that was made yesterday was the fact that we saw the volume that was put forward in the 108th Congress by the now-Chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, described as the "death of deliberative democracy," actually implemented here for the first time in the 220-year history of the United States of America. For the first time ever we saw a process begun which is in fact creating a scenario where the majority is ignoring the minority and doing what the American people do not want.

I do not believe that the American people want us to continue down the road towards a dramatic increase in Federal spending. People want to get the economy back on track, people want to make sure that their jobs aren't lost, but they're really wondering whether or not the way to do that is to have a huge increase in Federal spending, and yet that's exactly what is happening. And this rule is a perfect example of that.

Now, I was harshly criticized by Members of the now-majority when I had the privilege of chairing the House Rules Committee. But I will tell you the last time that I chaired the House Rules Committee there were seven amendments to the Legislative Branch Appropriations bills submitted to the Rules Committee, and I was pleased that I could make every single one of those in order. Every single amendment that was submitted was made in order. And as has been pointed out, 20 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee for the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, and only one amendment was made in order. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? Not one single amendment was made in order that would do what the American people want us to do and, that is, to reduce the size, scope, and reach of the Federal Government.

A 16 percent increase in the level of spending under this Legislative Branch Appropriations bill—and we all recognize that the need for Capitol Police and staff and oversight of the executive branch are all critically important things—but our colleague from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) offered an amendment that would simply provide a one-half of 1 percent reduction—one-half of 1 percent reduction—and yet the majority chose not to make even that amendment in order. Yes, there were larger proposals for cuts. And we know there is a tendency on this bill—that's why we've had a bipartisan agreement that this is the one of the 12 appropriations bills that we do have a structured rule on—but with a 16 percent increase in the bill, to not allow the House to work its will and have a chance for even a one-half of 1 percent reduction in that rate of growth, that's not what the American people want. That's not what the American people want.

And so the death of deliberative democracy was the history that was made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, because this is, in fact, the first time that this kind action has been taken and, unfortunately, it has begun a pattern. It's begun a pattern.

As I listened to my friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) refer to the fact that he was victimized by the bipartisan leadership when we in fact had said to him that we wanted to come to a time agreement on consideration of appropriations bills, it is evidence that we can at the leadership level—maybe not every rank-and-file Member—but that the leadership level worked together.

That is why I am very happy to see my very good friend from Wisconsin, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, here. And I would ask my friend, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, whether or not he believes that we could in fact come to some kind of agreement if we were to proceed with the appropriations process under an open rule. And I would be happy to yield to the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, if he would engage with me on this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The gentleman's time has expired, but I can answer what he asked, and I can also tell him I don't have time to yield.

We began in the Rules Committee with me asking the previous speaker whether or not his side had offered a time agreement. He looked at me as if I was talking about something that was foreign.

What I knew, and what I believe the leadership knew on both sides of the aisle, was that for a protracted period of time the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the majority leader have been meeting with their counterparts in the minority with reference to time agreements.

Now, I sat here when that bill began its debate and the first question out of Mr. OBEY's mouth to Mr. LEWIS, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the first question out of his mouth was whether or not they were going to be able to get a time agreement, and Mr. LEWIS' reply was that he could not give that assurance. So for somebody to come down here and talk about whether or not the Democrats tried to get a time agreement and then to spend time yesterday agreeing on nothing and accepting no more than foolishness on the House of Representatives, whether it was history making or not, is just plain absurdity.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member from California, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would like to yield to my friend from Florida to say to him that what I

was proposing that bill-by-bill we begin with a process, as has been done for the decades that I've been privileged to serve here, and make an attempt to work together to bring about some kind of agreement. No attempt was made to do that. The request was unprecedented in that it was a sweeping request made at the beginning of the appropriations process before we had even come to the floor and started working on this.

I would be happy to yield to my friend to respond to that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Most assuredly.

I would ask that you and I look at the RECORD when these proceedings conclude. And I can assure you that what Mr. OBEY asked Mr. LEWIS was whether or not they could get a time agreement. I was sitting here—

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, having participated in this process in the past, agreements are worked out, as Mr. KING said, between the two leaderships. And if we begin with the work of an appropriations bill and Members are in fact offering dilatory amendments, there is an effort made at the leadership level to bring about an agreement at that time. The notion of trying to impose that constraint before the process has even begun is wrong and it is unprecedented and it has been part of what has killed deliberative democracy under the leadership of this majority.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I have been told that when he was ranking member, Mr. OBEY would never agree to a time agreement before a consideration of a bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of the time of debate on this rule. I think we have had some very important issues brought forward by my distinguished colleagues who have come to share this debate this morning.

This is a bad rule because it does not allow for amendments to be offered on the floor for people to work their will here.

I do want to correct a couple of things that were said earlier this morning by my colleagues in terms of uninsured Americans. I think we have to do this every single time it's brought up.

My distinguished colleague from Florida said this earlier: there are 47 million uninsured Americans. There are not. Despite those claims—and I am quoting from "Crisis of the Uninsured: 2008" by the National Center for Policy Analysis—we have 12 million illegal aliens here. We have 14 million uninsured adults and children who are qualified for programs but have not enrolled. We have 18 million people who are uninsured who live in households with annual incomes above \$50,000 who could afford it. We have 18 million who are uninsured, but most of them are healthy and don't need it. Eighty-five percent of U.S. residents are privately insured and enrolled in a government

health program. Therefore, 95 percent of U.S. residents have health coverage or access to it, and the remaining 5 percent live in households that earn less than \$50,000 annually. That is about 7 million people.

I am getting so tired of hearing these misstatements made all the time. It's day after day after day that we keep getting these figures put out that are wrong.

But let's go back to this bill and to what's in this bill that we find really egregious. I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the bill because we have in here \$9 million for the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund. That's just one of the items that's in here that we don't need to be funding. It would be great to be able to have better relations with young people in other countries who come here; but, again, the American people are hurting.

The Republicans are on the side of the American people who are hurting here. We want to slow down the spending. There is a statement that came out yesterday about the difficulty we're having in selling bonds and the amount that we're selling. We are going into debt greater and greater in this country, and yet the Democrats seem to see no end to spending. They can't spend the American people's money fast enough.

There is money in here to do studies on demonstration projects to save energy. You know what? I look around this place every night; we can save lots of money on energy by just turning out the lights. The lights are left on all over the Capitol complex. We don't need to spend millions of dollars on studying what we can do to save energy. Just use common sense and cut down on the use of the energy that we have now. We're going to be wasting a huge amount of money.

Yesterday, the Treasury announced a record \$104 billion worth of bond auctions for next week, part of its Herculean efforts to finance the rescue of the world's largest economy. This was in the news today. It will exceed the previous record of \$101 billion set in auctions that took place in the last week of April.

We are spending our country more and more into debt. And why are we pushing things through? Why are we not allowing amendments? Because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee says we have to stick to his timetable. And yet, since the beginning of May, what have we dealt with here? We've had over 101 suspension bills, things like recognizing the Winston Churchill Memorial Library in Fulton, Missouri, as American's National Churchill Museum. Really important work—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."



Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I shall not use all that time, but I do yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard so much revisionist history put forward here, not the least of which just came from the distinguished colleague of mine from North Carolina, with reference to previous periods having to do with whether or not the minority requested time agreements.

One thing I've done since I've been in the House of Representatives is spend a lot of time on the floor of the House of Representatives. And that isn't looking to cause any praise to be directed to me. It became, over time, a part of my responsibilities that I assigned to myself to kind of know what was going on in this institution.

During that same period of time when Mr. OBEY was the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been on this floor when Mr. OBEY has requested time agreements when a bill is in progress and have participated in the discussions regarding it when the majority said no. So to come here and say that you always allowed for time agreements is just simply not the case.

The other thing that is ignored is the fact that the majority and the minority meet with regularity. I rather suspect that what's going on here, with nobody having said a word to me about it, is that there has been a little bit of a strategy by my friends on the other side to ensure, among other things, that they will slow down the process and that we will not be able to get the business of the people done. The greatest evidence of that was the transpiration of events here yesterday.

Now, another gentleman here spoke, my friend from Iowa, with reference to the Rules Committee being upstairs in a small place. That's where it was when I got here, that's where it is now, and I rather suspect when he and I leave, that's where it will be. But to suggest that the media does not cover the Rules Committee evidently ignores the fact that everything that we say is transcribed by these people that are reporters, who we overwork and abuse well on into nights when we could have been saving taxpayers money by letting them get about their business and all of the staff related around here that this legislative branch is about. All of what we do is recorded.

□ 1015

In addition to that, no reporter is refused to be there, and C-SPAN often chooses to cover the Rules Committee dependent upon whether or not there is a matter of substance that they would want to cover.

Now, my friends on the other side have had 12 years of rulemaking. I served on the Rules Committee in the

minority a lot of that time. During that period of time, you didn't regulate financial services. You didn't provide a sensible health care plan. You didn't give our children what was needed. You said what you were going to do is leave no child behind. And you did not only leave children behind; in certain places in this country you lost them and couldn't find them. Our parks, our environment deteriorated and were plundered and abused and used in a way that was beyond the pale, and yet we come in here and talk about spending.

What would you say to all of the people that work in a bank that got saved? They're Americans. What would you say to all of the people in the financial services and on Wall Street that found themselves employed? They're Americans. What would you say to the automobile industry employees and their directors that have their limited jobs saved and too many gone because of mistakes that were made by government and industry? What would you say to those working people? They're Americans.

You're telling me that when we spend money, we are not spending that money in a way that's helping America. What do you say to your communities like mine that are finding themselves in the position of having to cut services with regularity and it usually starts with the poor and the disabled? They're Americans.

And somewhere along the line, I would ask you the question, what would you have this President that's been in office now nearly 5 months not do? Would you have him not do health care? Would you have him not do anything about climate change? Would you have him not do anything about the fact that you didn't regulate the industries that needed to be regulated appropriately during the time that you were in the majority?

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we are here on provides for consideration of the legislative branch appropriations. We've heard the measures, and all will be able to see that this bill provides a pragmatic and fiscally responsible approach to funding this legislative branch.

Footnote right there: the fine young people that work with us. When I came here I was permitted, as every Member, to have 18 full-time staffers, and I haven't always had 18 full-time staffers. But from 1992 until now, it's been that many staffers with an increase in the workload. Now, some of you all don't pay these young people well enough and you know it, and you need to pay attention to that. And if you do get an increase, give it to the children that work with you and you might have a better-run office.

The funding provided in this legislation will help us do our jobs better, faster, and it increases funding for the Congressional Budget Office that we continue to use, rightly so. Particularly, the pay-goers need their analysis done.

Mr. Speaker, I will stop now by saying that this appropriations bill helps make the work of the legislative branch more accessible to people throughout our Nation and the globe. I'm encouraged that through the bill, the Appropriations Committee has helped to ensure that all visitors touring this Capitol have equal and adequate access to this facility.

With that in mind, I just urge my friends to remember that while they are making up their history, there are some of us that remember it well, and I can assure you that the things that I have said can be documented from that record.

I would hope that we would know that this bill honors our history and prepares us for the future. It invests in the preservation and protection of the Capitol complex and makes more efficient, more accessible the opportunities for the people that we serve.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that remarks in debate are properly directed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TODAY

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 560.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.